IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.2831 OF 2005

M/s. Vardhaman Lifestyle Developers
& Anr. ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Owen Menezes i/by Kishore Thakurdas & Co. for Petitioner.

Mr. G.W. Mattos, A.G.P. for R. Nos. 1 and 3.

Mrs. P.A. Purandhare for R. Nos. 2, 4 to 7.

CORAM: F.I. REBELLO &
MRS.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,JJ.
DATE : 4TH AUGUST, 2006

P.C.:

. Rule. Heard forthwith.

. The Apex court in various appeals filed before it in the matter of challenge to the orders of this court, under D.R. Regulation 33(7) has remitted the matter to this court to decide the validity of D.C. Regulation 33(7). The present petition can be disposed of by issuing some directions. The Petitioners have already applied for development permission under D.C. Regulation 33(7). They have been granted N.O.C. The challenge to the D.C. Regulation 33(7) is before this court. On behalf of the Corporation, their learned counsel makes a statement that based on the N.O.C. the Corporation is issuing IOD and C.C. pursuant to the order of the Supreme Court. In the light of that Respondent Corporation to grant IOD and C.C. to the Petitioners, if otherwise, they comply with the

requirements of law.

. Needless to say that the permission granted will be subject to the order passed by the Apex court as contended in the interim orders and the order that this court may pass in the petition challenging the vires of D.C. Regulation 33(7).

. With the above observations, Petition disposed of.

(MRS.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.) **(F.I.REBELLO, J.)**